

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This is responsive to the Office Action dated January 25, 2005.

The undersigned thanks the Examiner for his action in renumbering claims 24-29 as new claims 30-35, and examining claims 30-35. We also thank the Examiner for recognizing patentable subject matter in dependent claims 12, 16, 19, 21, 31-34, 35/31, 35/32, and 35/34.

Claims 2, 7-9, 13-15, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 30 and 35/30 were rejected over the admitted prior art on pages 1-2, taken in view of Leander. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 is directed to a double-sided adhesive tape comprising two features:

- 1) on each side, a pattern comprising adhesive and non-adhesive sections; and
- 2) an adhesive section on the first side is in contact with a non-adhesive section on the second side.

The admitted prior art and Leander do not disclose either feature (1) or feature (2). The Examiner cited Leander as disclosing feature (2), but the applicant must respectfully disagree. The Leander reference does not disclose contact between an adhesive section on a first side and a non-adhesive section on the second side of a two-sided tape. Leander teaches that adhesive material on one side of a rolled-up tape must be protected by a lining or release layer from contact with the other side, which would prevent contact with a non-adhesive section as claimed. Thus, Leander teaches away from the feature in the final paragraph of claim 2, because it teaches affirmatively that a release layer is present between the adhesive portions (which are disposed exclusively on one side of Leander's tape) and the other (non-adhesive) face of the tape. See col. 2, lines 26-28.

The Examiner, acknowledging Leander's release layer, says that the claims "do not forbid the presence of such release layers or the like." On the contrary, the only reasonable interpretation of "contact" in this application is that there is no release layer or the like between the adhesive and non-adhesive portions. See page 3, line 19; page 5, line 23- page 6, line 1; page 6, lines 15-16; and especially page 6, line 22- page 7, line 7:

"When the double-sided tape (20) is wound onto bobbin (11) as a roll, the "A" side is outside and the "B" side is inside. The "A" side of the adhesive section (60) will be rolled in contact with the "B" side of the non-adhesive section (61), as shown in Figure 3(a), and the "B" side of the adhesive section (60) will be rolled in contact with the "A" side of the non-adhesive section (61).

Therefore, in the case of a double-sided tape (20) no adhesive is needed for the area of the non-adhesive section (61), which results in adhesive savings that correspond to the size of this area. This method also enables rolling the tape without requiring an additional lining for the non-adhesive section (61) of the "A" and "B" sides." (emphasis added).

Therefore, the admitted prior art and Leander et al., taken together, neither disclose nor suggest the features of claims 2, 13-15, 17, 18, 30 and 35/30.

Claims 7 and 17 recite a dispenser containing a single-sided and a double-sided adhesive tape, respectively. None of the cited prior art has any relevance to a dispenser. These claims and their dependent claims 8-9 and 18 should be allowed.

Claim 20 is directed to a notepad comprising a double-sided adhesive tape having the features of claim 2. Claims 20, 22 and 23 should be allowed for the same reasons as claim 2.

Accordingly, allowance of claims 2, 7-9, 13-15, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 30 and 35/30 is requested.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being faxed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 at (703) 872-9306, on April 25, 2005:

James A. Finder

Name of applicant, assignee or  
Registered Representative

Signature

April 25, 2005

Date of Signature

JAF:lf

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Finder

Registration No.: 30,173

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700